

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
AUSTIN DIVISION

1 BANDSPEED, INC., CAMBRIDGE SILICON RADIO LIMITED, )  
2 )  
3 VS. ) AU:11-CV-00771-LY  
4 )  
5 ACER, INC., ACER AMERICA CORPORATION, BELKIN )  
6 INTERNATIONAL, INC., BELKIN, INC., CASIO COMPUTER CO., )  
7 LTD., CASIO HITACHI MOBILE COMMUNICATIONS CO., LTD., )  
8 CASIO AMERICA, INC., DELL INC., GARMIN INTERNATIONAL, )  
9 INC., GARMIN USA, INC., GN NETCOM A/S, GN U.S., INC., )  
10 HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY, HEWLETT-PACKARD DEVELOPMENT )  
11 COMPANY, L.P., HTC CORPORATION, HTC AMERICA, INC., HUAWEI )  
12 TECHNOLOGIES COMPANY, LTD., KYOCERA CORPORATION, KYOCERA )  
13 INTERNATIONAL, INC., KYOCERA COMMUNICATIONS, INC., )  
14 KYOCERA WIRELESS CORPORATION, LENOVO (UNITED STATES) )  
15 INC., LG ELECTRONICS, INC., LG ELECTRONICS U.S.A., INC., )  
16 LG ELECTRONICS MOBILECOMM U.S.A., INC., MOTOROLA )  
17 SOLUTIONS, INC., NOKIA CORPORATION, NOKIA INC., PANTECH )  
18 WIRELESS, INC., PLANTRONICS, INC., RESEARCH IN MOTION )  
19 LIMITED, RESEARCH IN MOTION CORPORATION, SAMSUNG )  
20 TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, LLC, TOMTOM INTERNATIONAL )  
21 B.V., TOMTOM, INC., TOSHIBA CORPORATION, TOSHIBA AMERICA )  
22 INFORMATION SYSTEMS, INC., TOSHIBA AMERICA, INC., )  
23 BLUETOOTH SIG, INC., MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC., PANTECH )  
24 WIRELESS, INC., BELKIN, INC., BELKIN INTERNATIONAL, INC., )  
25 LENOVO (UNITED STATES) INC., MOTOROLA SOLUTIONS, INC., )  
TOSHIBA CORPORATION, TOSHIBA AMERICA, INC., TOSHIBA )  
AMERICA INFORMATION SYSTEMS, INC., TOMTOM, INC., )  
PLANTRONICS, INC., SAMSUNG TELECOMMUNICATIONS AMERICA, )  
LLC, HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY, HEWLETT-PACKARD DEVELOPMENT )  
COMPANY, L.P., GARMIN USA, INC., GARMIN INTERNATIONAL, )  
INC., KYOCERA COMMUNICATIONS, INC., KYOCERA )  
INTERNATIONAL, INC., GN U.S., INC., GN NETCOM A/S, LG )  
ELECTRONICS, INC., LG ELECTRONICS MOBILECOMM U.S.A., )  
INC., LG ELECTRONICS U.S.A., INC., DELL INC., RESEARCH )  
IN MOTION LIMITED, RESEARCH IN MOTION CORPORATION, )  
HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES COMPANY, LTD., HTC AMERICA, INC., )  
HTC CORPORATION, TOMTOM INTERNATIONAL B.V., MOTOROLA )  
MOBILITY, INC., BANDSPEED, INC., TOSHIBA AMERICA )  
INFORMATION SYSTEMS, INC., SONY ELECTRONICS INC., SONY )  
COMPUTER ENTERTAINMENT AMERICA, INC., LEGO SYSTEMS, INC., )  
PARROT, INC., SONY COMPUTER ENTERTAINMENT AMERICA, INC., )  
SONY ELECTRONICS INC., KYOCERA COMMUNICATIONS, INC., )  
KYOCERA INTERNATIONAL, INC., CAMBRIDGE SILICON RADIO )  
LIMITED, PARROT, INC., CAMBRIDGE SILICON RADIO LIMITED, )  
CAMBRIDGE SILICON RADIO LIMITED, BLUETOOTH SIG, INC. ) APRIL 12, 2012

\*\*\*\*\*  
TRANSCRIPT OF NON-EVIDENTIARY HEARING  
BEFORE THE HONORABLE LEE YEAKEL  
\*\*\*\*\*

APPEARANCES:

FOR BANDSPEED, INC.:

KURT MATTHEW SAUER  
DAFFER MCDANIEL, LLP  
700 LAVACA, SUITE 720  
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701

CHRISTOPHER V. GOODPASTOR  
WATT'S GUERRA CRAFT LLP  
811 BARTON SPRINGS ROAD, SUITE 725  
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78704

ANDREW G. DINOVO  
ADAM G. PRICE  
7000 NORTH MOPAC, SUITE 350  
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78731

PATRICK E. KING (VIA TELEPHONE)  
SIMPSON THACHER & BARTLETT LLP  
2550 HANOVER STREET  
PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA 94304

BRIAN AE SMITH (VIA TELEPHONE)  
DEWEY & LEBOEUF LLP  
1 MONTGOMERY ST., STE. 3500  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94104

MICHAEL FALCON  
JUSTIN STREITBERGER

FOR LEGO SYSTEMS, INC.:

STACY ALLEN  
JACKSON WALKER L.L.P.  
100 CONGRESS, SUITE 1100  
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701

NICHOLAS A. PISARSKY  
DAY PITNEY LLP  
242 TRUMBULL STREET  
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06103-1212

FOR CAMBRIDGE SILICON  
RADIO, LIMITED:

CLAUDIA WILSON FROST  
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN  
909 FANNIN, SUITE 2000  
HOUSTON, TEXAS 77010

1 APPEARANCES:  
(CONTINUED)

2 FOR LG ELECTRONICS, INC.: WASIF QURESHI  
3 FISH & RICHARDSON PC  
4 1221 MCKINNEY ST, STE 2800  
HOUSTON, TEXAS 77010

5 FOR PARROT, INC.: BRENNNA G. NAVA  
6 HAYNES AND BOONE, L.L.P.  
7 112 EAST PECAN, SUITE 1200  
SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS 78205

8 FOR ACER, INC.: BRIAN CRAFT  
9 FINDLAY CRAFT, LLP  
6760 OLD JACKSONVILLE HWY, STE 101  
TYLER, TEXAS 75703

10 FOR BELKIN INTERNATIONAL, KEVIN JAMES TERRAZAS  
11 INC: YETTER COLEMAN LLP  
221 WEST 6TH STREET, SUITE 750  
12 AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701

13 FOR GARMIN INTERNATIONAL, STEVEN J. WINGARD  
14 INC.: SCOTT, DOUGLASS & MCCONNICO, LLP  
600 CONGRESS AVENUE, SUITE 1500  
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701

15 MICHELLE L. MARRIOTT  
16 ERISE IP, P.A.  
5251 W. 116TH PLACE  
17 LEAWOOD, KANSAS 66211

18 FOR KYOCERA INTERNATIONAL, WILLIAM B. NASH  
19 INC.: HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP  
112 E. PECAN STREET, SUITE 1200  
SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS 78205

20 FOR HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES DANIEL T. O'BRIEN  
21 COMPANY, LTD.: JONES DAY  
2727 NORTH HARWOOD STREET  
22 DALLAS, TEXAS 75201-1515

23 FOR RESEARCH IN MOTION, LTD: PHILIP W. WOO  
24 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP - SAN FRANCISCO  
555 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 2000  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94104

25

1 APPEARANCES:  
2 (CONTINUED)

3 DAVID B. WEAVER  
4 JANICE LE TA  
5 AJEET P. PAI  
6 VINSON & ELKINS, LLP  
7 2801 VIA FORTUNA, SUITE 100  
8 AUSTIN, TEXAS 78746

9 ANTHONY S. KIM  
10 RESEARCH IN MOTION CORP.  
11 2000 BRIDGE PKWY., STE. 100  
12 REDWOOD CITY, CALIFORNIA 94065

13 FOR MOTOROLA  
14 SOLUTIONS, INC.:

15 BONNIE M. GRANT  
16 WILLIAM H. BOICE  
17 KILPATRICK TOWNSEND AND  
18 STOCKTON LLP  
19 1100 PEACHTREE ST. NE, SUITE 2800  
20 ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30309

21 FOR PLANTRONICS, INC.:

22 THOMAS E. BEJIN  
23 RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER  
24 39533 WOODWARD AVENUE, SUITE 140  
25 BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MICHIGAN 48304

FOR TOSHIBA CORPORATION:

DAVID PHILIP WHITTLESEY  
ANDREWS KURTH LLP  
111 CONGRESS AVENUE, SUITE 1700  
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701

FOR BLUETOOTH SIG, INC.:

CLYDE M. SIEBMAN  
SIEBMAN REYNOLDS BURG PHILLIPS &  
SMITH LLP  
300 NORTH TRAVIS STREET  
SHERMAN, TEXAS 75090

COURT REPORTER:

ARLINDA RODRIGUEZ, CSR  
200 WEST 8TH STREET  
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701  
(512) 916-5143

24 Proceedings recorded by computerized stenography, transcript  
25 produced by computer.

09:39:30 1 (Open Court)

10:02:58 2 THE COURT: Are there any lawyers left in Austin that  
10:03:01 3 are not in front of me today? Well, anybody who is left in  
10:03:10 4 Austin who is not here and doesn't have a member of his or her  
10:03:13 5 firm here clearly is suffering through the recession unlike the  
10:03:19 6 rest of us.

10:03:20 7 I'm not going to take up your time going around the  
10:03:24 8 room and having you announce. Just whenever you get up to  
10:03:28 9 speak, announce who you are and who you represent. And before  
10:03:35 10 everyone leaves, make sure that Ms. Rodriguez, the reporter,  
10:03:39 11 has your appearance. And we'll do it that way. Otherwise, we  
10:03:43 12 burn up what precious time I have to be here before my next  
10:03:48 13 matter.

10:03:49 14 All right. What we are here for is a hearing that  
10:03:57 15 was ordered in my order of December 14th, 2011, which reads:  
10:04:09 16 The case is set for a scheduling conference on Thursday,  
10:04:12 17 April 12th, 2012 at 10 a.m. in Courtroom Number 1, second  
10:04:17 18 floor, United States Courthouse, et cetera, to discuss  
10:04:21 19 revisions to the order that I rendered that date that may be  
10:04:23 20 necessary of additional chip manufactures or suppliers added as  
10:04:29 21 parties in the case, as well as a schedule for the issues  
10:04:32 22 beyond those in Bandspeed and CSR.

10:04:36 23 The Court anticipates determining all scheduling  
10:04:40 24 matters not specifically addressed in this order at the  
10:04:42 25 conference. The parties are ordered to meet and confer prior

10:04:45 1 to the conference to agree on a schedule that reasonably  
10:04:55 2 accommodates one another.

10:04:57 3           Now, first off, however, before I get there, let me  
10:05:00 4 say that paragraph 7 of that order states that on or before  
10:05:03 5 April 5th, 2012, any chip supplier or manufacturer who has  
10:05:06 6 joined as a party in this case after the date of this order  
10:05:09 7 shall file and serve a list of claims other than those claims  
10:05:13 8 construed in this Court's August 12th, 2011 claims construction  
10:05:18 9 order contained in any patent-in-suit that the parties request  
10:05:23 10 the Court to construe and any objection the party may have to  
10:05:28 11 the Court's August 12th order. In every respect, the Court's  
10:05:31 12 August 12th order shall govern claims construction in the  
10:05:35 13 consolidated case.

10:05:37 14           Although I got in a bunch of things recently, I would  
10:05:47 15 say that this is an environmental disaster with the amount of  
10:05:51 16 paperwork and things we've got, except some of you came in a  
10:05:54 17 little early and heard me hearing closing arguments on the  
10:05:59 18 Sierra Club case. And lawyers pointed that out that in that  
10:06:02 19 case, it is environmental cases that do the most damage to the  
10:06:06 20 environment as opposed to patent cases. So you-all are off the  
10:06:10 21 hook on that.

10:06:11 22           But I have not found any additional lists of claims  
10:06:20 23 that any party desires me to construe, nor have I found an  
10:06:25 24 objection that any party may have to the August 12th order. Am  
10:06:29 25 I correct in that, or are there documents or electronic filings

10:06:35 1 floating around that I have not yet seen, because that would  
10:06:38 2 not be unusual?

10:06:41 3 MR. BOICE: Your Honor, Bill Boice for Motorola.

10:06:45 4 THE COURT: Come to the podium.

10:06:45 5 MR. BOICE: Sorry, Your Honor. Bill Boice for  
10:06:47 6 Motorola. I believe you are correct. We are not seeking any  
10:06:50 7 additional claims construction nor any objections.

10:06:58 8 THE COURT: All right. I just want to make sure,  
10:06:59 9 because when I look at the docket in this case, we're already  
10:06:59 10 at 877 documents. And that presumes that the clerk got all of  
10:07:03 11 the documents transferred over when I consolidated the existing  
10:07:07 12 cases. So I'm just trying to focus on what I have not dealt  
10:07:15 13 with.

10:07:15 14 Now, the second matter, then -- we'll go to  
10:07:19 15 paragraph 8 -- is the joint submission of proposed amended  
10:07:25 16 scheduling orders. Who wants to tell me about those? I will  
10:07:34 17 allow you to talk, but first let me address this to Ms. Frost.  
10:07:43 18 Is CSR in any way a party to any of these proposed amended  
10:07:49 19 scheduling orders? It's easy for me to read everybody else,  
10:07:53 20 but some of them are exhibits to others. They only came in  
10:07:56 21 yesterday. I cannot tell you how thrilled I am to get things  
10:08:00 22 of this length the day before I have a hearing scheduled. So I  
10:08:05 23 may not cover as much ground as I want to cover today, because  
10:08:10 24 if my docket wasn't large enough, it has gone off the charts in  
10:08:14 25 April and I have very little time in April.

10:08:18 1           Were it not for the fact that I was concerned that  
10:08:21 2 many of you were not having good billing months in April, I  
10:08:24 3 might have considered resetting this case. So, Ms. Frost, what  
10:08:28 4 is CSR's position on the joint proposed amended scheduling  
10:08:36 5 orders? And I presume you have seen them, number one?

10:08:39 6           MS. FROST: Good morning, Your Honor. And, yes, I  
10:08:40 7 saw them briefly last evening, probably a little after they  
10:08:43 8 were filed in the Court. And right now there's nothing that  
10:08:47 9 I'm aware of that impacts us directly.

10:08:56 10           THE COURT: So then let me then speak with  
10:08:58 11 Mr. Goodpastor about what they do, because I have not compared  
10:09:02 12 the dates in them yet to the dates that I had previously  
10:09:06 13 scheduled. So tell me what you attempt to do by these orders.

10:09:12 14           MR. GOODPASTOR: Chris Goodpastor for Bandspeed,  
10:09:17 15 Your Honor. Just one clarification with respect to what we've  
10:09:19 16 proposed as it relates to the CSR case. We sent an E-mail to  
10:09:24 17 Ms. Frost yesterday with this one particular issue, and  
10:09:28 18 Ms. Frost has told me that they oppose the addition of it.

10:09:31 19           But if you look on Exhibit A under -- on page 3 next  
10:09:36 20 to the date, December 28th, 2012, Bandspeed proposes adding  
10:09:46 21 another date by which we would limit our claims to ten in  
10:09:50 22 advance of trial and we would also ask CSR limit their  
10:09:53 23 invalidity references or accommodations to two at that time.

10:09:57 24           I understand that --

10:09:58 25           THE COURT: Where is that -- one of the things



10:10:00 1 that -- you heard me say this before, but you always get to  
10:10:08 2 hear me get on my high horse over and over again. And some  
10:10:10 3 people are new here, so they haven't heard this speech before.

10:10:14 4           Electronic filing is wonderful for lawyers and clerks  
10:10:16 5 of court. It is not particularly good for judges. One of the  
10:10:25 6 reasons it's not particularly good is represented by this  
10:10:27 7 filing, in that I have no problem probably with the substance  
10:10:31 8 of what you're doing, but it takes me a while to get what  
10:10:35 9 you're referring to because when we print it out, it doesn't  
10:10:39 10 give me tabbed pages where you can say, if you go to Tab A.  
10:10:43 11 You can just tell me go to exhibit something, and that still  
10:10:48 12 means I've got to flip through until I get to it.

10:10:52 13           So I am on page 3 of Exhibit A. And what paragraph  
10:10:54 14 are you referring to, Mr. Goodpastor.

10:10:57 15           MR. GOODPASTOR: The top paragraph. If you look at  
10:10:59 16 the --

10:11:00 17           THE COURT: I've got it.

10:11:01 18           MR. GOODPASTOR: -- case number, it's Document 867-1  
10:11:04 19 on page 3. And the top paragraph is December 28th, 2012.

10:11:09 20           THE COURT: All right. And, Ms. Frost, what is your  
10:11:12 21 or CSR's objection to that?

10:11:15 22           MS. FROST: Your Honor, first I obviously missed it,  
10:11:18 23 too, reading it on my Blackberry. So I empathize.

10:11:21 24           THE COURT: It's a hard effort. I understand that.

10:11:23 25           MS. FROST: Our objection is twofold. First, in our

10:11:26 1 scheduling order, I believe we have a date of August 4 --  
10:11:32 2 sometime in August for the close of fact discovery, and that it  
10:11:35 3 was our understanding that the limitation of claims by -- by  
10:11:41 4 Bandspeed would be made at the close of fact discovery and  
10:11:45 5 before the commencement of expert discovery in order to try to  
10:11:50 6 minimize inefficiencies and burdensomeness that having an  
10:11:54 7 expert go through 50 claims and do an analysis of 50 claims,  
10:12:00 8 when they're ultimately going to be boiled down to 10, seems  
10:12:05 9 inefficient and wasteful to us.

10:12:08 10           So our proposal has always been, if claims are going  
10:12:12 11 to be limited, which we believe they should be, they should be  
10:12:14 12 limited at the close of discovery. So for us that would be  
10:12:17 13 August of 2012.

10:12:18 14           With regard to limiting the number of invalidity  
10:12:22 15 contentions that we can make or references we can use, I have  
10:12:25 16 frankly never had anybody ask me to do that before and I can't  
10:12:28 17 possibly know whether that's a reasonable request at all until  
10:12:31 18 I know which claims are at issue. There may be claims about  
10:12:35 19 which we have to combine references. For example, for a 103  
10:12:38 20 rejection, we would -- our argument, for obviousness we would  
10:12:42 21 make, we might need four or five claims for that -- four or  
10:12:46 22 five references for that instead of just two. So we can't  
10:12:50 23 agree certainly in the abstract that, and I don't think we can  
10:12:53 24 agree to it in principle at all. And I'm sorry I missed it in  
10:12:57 25 the order.

10:12:58 1 THE COURT: No. That's all right. And I applaud  
10:13:02 2 Mr. Goodpastor for pointing it out.

10:13:06 3 MR. GOODPASTOR: Your Honor, I have three bullet  
10:13:08 4 points, if I may?

10:13:09 5 THE COURT: You may.

10:13:09 6 MR. GOODPASTOR: Okay. The limitation that's  
10:13:12 7 previously in the order after the close of fact discovery does  
10:13:15 8 not expressly state the number of claimants that we're to limit  
10:13:19 9 to.

10:13:19 10 THE COURT: I know it doesn't.

10:13:21 11 MR. GOODPASTOR: And, secondly, we do believe that  
10:13:23 12 expert discovery is relevant to our further limitation to  
10:13:26 13 claims. It's our understanding that it's preferable to get  
10:13:32 14 down to ten right before trial, and that's what we're trying to  
10:13:35 15 do. Also, we feel the same obligation should be put on CSR  
10:13:39 16 with respect to invalidity.

10:13:42 17 My -- what I'm hearing from Ms. Frost is maybe they  
10:13:44 18 have some problem with the number, but not the concept. But we  
10:13:49 19 think it would be appropriate, if we're going to limit and  
10:13:52 20 offer to make that limitation to ten, that there should be some  
10:13:55 21 limitations on the invalidity references.

10:13:58 22 THE COURT: Well, I'm not going to take that up here  
10:14:00 23 today. It's something y'all should have discussed before you  
10:14:02 24 came in here today. I don't have time or the desire to conduct  
10:14:09 25 conferences between the two of you. Right now what I am trying

10:14:18 1 to do is get the trial in this case, the first phase of it  
10:14:31 2 between Bandspeed and CSR, to trial as I have previously  
10:14:37 3 scheduled it. Let me inquire, because I haven't read through  
10:14:47 4 this, does your proposed scheduling changes affect the trial  
10:14:53 5 date, Mr. Goodpastor.

10:14:57 6 MR. GOODPASTOR: Or proposed scheduling changes do  
10:14:59 7 not currently affect the trial date. However, we do state in  
10:15:02 8 our footnote on page 867-1 -- I think it's the one marked page  
10:15:07 9 2 of 7 -- that much of this schedule depends upon our ability  
10:15:13 10 to get the stipulated discovery from the -- what we call the  
10:15:18 11 CSR end-product defendants. That is the discovery we need from  
10:15:24 12 those end-product defendants who use CSR chips to prosecute our  
10:15:29 13 claims and defenses with respect to the CSR case.

10:15:32 14 It's discovery we've requested. We think it's due.  
10:15:36 15 But to kind of cut to the chase and streamline things as much  
10:15:40 16 as possible, we put in very specific proposals about what  
10:15:44 17 information needs to be disclosed on April 26th regarding all  
10:15:49 18 of the end-product accused products, all of the chips used in  
10:15:53 19 those accused products, and the volume of those products sold.  
10:15:56 20 That information --

10:15:57 21 THE COURT: All right. Now, where do I find that?

10:15:59 22 MR. GOODPASTOR: Your Honor, that is on document  
10:16:01 23 867-1, page 2 of 7. It's the first entry of April 26th, 2012.

10:16:11 24 THE COURT: 867-1. Page 2 what?

10:16:17 25 MR. GOODPASTOR: Page 2 of 7. It's the very first

10:16:19 1 entry on Bandspeed's proposed order that's attached as  
10:16:23 2 Exhibit A.

10:16:25 3 THE COURT: All right. I'm just trying to figure out  
10:16:28 4 what page number. Oh. Two of seven. I wasn't understanding  
10:16:31 5 you. All right. And do you define in here "end-product  
10:16:42 6 defendant"?

10:16:43 7 MR. GOODPASTOR: We could add that.

10:16:45 8 THE COURT: I mean, do they know who they are?

10:16:47 9 MR. GOODPASTOR: It's everyone but Bluetooth SIG and  
10:16:50 10 CSR.

10:16:51 11 THE COURT: It's not hard.

10:16:52 12 MR. GOODPASTOR: We can definitely add that. But  
10:16:57 13 what it does is we've asked for this information in discovery.  
10:17:00 14 The end-product defendants have previously taken the  
10:17:03 15 position -- I don't know if they continue to take the  
10:17:05 16 position -- that they're not going to respond to the  
10:17:07 17 discovery. But I think we've had some discussions that --

10:17:10 18 THE COURT: Well, I'm going to tell you basically  
10:17:13 19 where I am. I'm tired of worrying about discovery. My default  
10:17:16 20 is probably going to be, after I talk to you-all today, to give  
10:17:20 21 everybody all the discovery they want and be done with it. I'm  
10:17:23 22 tired of trying to manage discovery. I'm tired of dealing with  
10:17:27 23 y'all not being able to agree on it. I understand that you  
10:17:31 24 have good reasons, both of you, to resist things. I'm just  
10:17:36 25 tired of messing with it.

10:17:36 1 I think I've given you ample time to reach  
10:17:39 2 agreement. You cannot do it. I'm likely -- not to pick a  
10:17:42 3 side, I'm likely to come down -- I'm in the latter stages of  
10:17:46 4 dealing with the order that handles the previous discovery  
10:17:53 5 requests between CSR and Bandspeed that you couldn't agree on  
10:17:56 6 and the protective order that you can't agree on.

10:18:00 7 The problem that you run into is, once you can't  
10:18:04 8 agree, it becomes mine. That's why the taxpayers pay me. And  
10:18:13 9 what you run into is it takes me time to get things out because  
10:18:17 10 of the other cases that I have on my docket. That's the cross  
10:18:21 11 you bear. That will all get simpler when we get in the new  
10:18:28 12 courthouse, because we will have sufficient courtrooms for me  
10:18:31 13 to bring in a visiting judge to handle parts of my docket while  
10:18:35 14 I work on other parts of my docket. Right now I don't have any  
10:18:38 15 place to put a visiting judge if I got one up here. So it  
10:18:46 16 takes me longer and is taking me longer to deal with those  
10:18:48 17 matters than I thought it was going to take me to deal with  
10:18:52 18 those matters.

10:18:53 19 So the problem that you-all face, and I say this to  
10:18:59 20 everyone, is when you can't agree on something, it becomes mine  
10:19:02 21 to work out, which I don't mind doing. But it takes time to do  
10:19:07 22 that. And the time comes out of your time, when you could be  
10:19:12 23 doing something else or knowing how you're going to approach  
10:19:14 24 that. And that's just the world you live in. As I stated the  
10:19:19 25 last time we were all together, lawyers have a hard job and not

10:19:26 1 every case is easy. This case is a hard case, primarily  
10:19:33 2 logistically. I don't find it very difficult when I get the  
10:19:36 3 time to look at parts of it substantively, but it is a logistic  
10:19:43 4 problem for you-all and for the Courts.

10:19:46 5 One of things that was discussed at our last  
10:19:54 6 conference is how we handle -- if there is not a settlement  
10:19:57 7 after I try Bandspeed and CSR, the other cases, some people  
10:20:03 8 have concern about the American Invents Act and whether one can  
10:20:08 9 try this as a joint case. I explained to everyone, and I hope  
10:20:12 10 everyone is now comfortable with it, that I am not trying and  
10:20:16 11 am not going against the American's Invents Act when I combine  
10:20:19 12 everything for discovery.

10:20:21 13 To the extent there is disagreement on how to try the  
10:20:23 14 other cases, the way we will handle that is divide it out into  
10:20:29 15 the number of cases that the individual defendants desire to  
10:20:35 16 have tried alone. We will spend whatever time it takes to  
10:20:43 17 select a series juries, and we will line the cases up in the  
10:20:46 18 order they appear in the caption and try them *ad seriatim*. As  
10:20:53 19 soon as one jury goes out to deliberate, we will start the next  
10:20:56 20 case. I will have someone else handling the rest of my docket,  
10:20:59 21 and we will just proceed ahead and move through them all.

10:21:05 22 To the extent that anybody desires to combine the  
10:21:10 23 case and have one trial, I am not concerned about the length of  
10:21:14 24 it. I'm here full business days every day, and it matters not  
10:21:21 25 to me if I'm trying one case for six weeks or I'm trying six

10:21:29 1 cases in six weeks. So you need not worry about our end on the  
10:21:35 2 logistics.

10:21:36 3 The plan is going to be to try Bandspeed and CSR. A  
10:21:44 4 judgment is rendered in that case, and then we will get  
10:21:49 5 together and determine what's left to try, and we're going to  
10:21:52 6 schedule it at one time. We will pick the juries. There will  
10:21:58 7 be six-person juries. We will pick the juries on an  
10:22:02 8 accelerated basis, which means there won't be a whole lot of  
10:22:08 9 voir dire. And then we'll try the cases one after the other  
10:22:10 10 until I get this cause resolved.

10:22:14 11 So that's what I'm dealing with, because we're going  
10:22:22 12 to get it resolved. Now while I'm on the question of these  
10:22:26 13 scheduling orders, I note that I have the one problem that  
10:22:33 14 Ms. Frost points out. Are there any other defendants known to  
10:22:39 15 the plaintiff as an end-product defendant who has any  
10:22:44 16 disagreement with any of the proposed scheduling orders that I  
10:22:49 17 received yesterday, which are all combined in some way, shape,  
10:22:54 18 or form into document 867, with exhibits for purposes of the  
10:23:00 19 Court's record. And I want to hear if anybody else has any  
10:23:03 20 violent disagreement with any of this?

10:23:14 21 MR. BOICE: Your Honor, we have proposed some --

10:23:16 22 THE COURT: State who you are.

10:23:17 23 MR. BOICE: I'm sorry. Bill Boice for Motorola  
10:23:20 24 Mobility and Motorola Solutions. We have proposed some minor  
10:23:24 25 modifications to the proposed schedule that Bandspeed sent to



10:23:29 1 us last night. And our proposal is Exhibit B, and then there's  
10:23:33 2 a red line of the two, which is Exhibit C -- or attachment C I  
10:23:37 3 think is what it's called -- to what you have there,  
10:23:40 4 Your Honor.

10:23:40 5 THE COURT: I have that. Have you had time to  
10:23:42 6 discuss those minor proposals with Bandspeed?

10:23:48 7 MR. BOICE: No, Your Honor. I don't believe we  
10:23:50 8 have. And we can do that. We just have not had chance to do  
10:23:56 9 that. We may have had some discussions over the course of  
10:23:59 10 time, but we did not yesterday have a discussion, Your Honor.

10:24:04 11 THE COURT: All right. Well, what I want is for you  
10:24:06 12 to have that discussion, and I want to know what can be agreed  
10:24:11 13 on. And then I want to know with specificity what the open  
10:24:15 14 issues are, and I will just make the decision as to how I'm  
10:24:20 15 going deal with scheduling this case. I'm not going to spend a  
10:24:26 16 lot of time talking to everybody about that.

10:24:28 17 MR. BOICE: Your Honor, if I might, I will tell you  
10:24:30 18 that we generally agree with the approach that Bandspeed has  
10:24:34 19 taken and agree with most of the dates. Consequently, we tried  
10:24:37 20 to use their schedule, and we made just some edits to it to add  
10:24:41 21 in and change a few dates because of our inability to meet  
10:24:45 22 those dates. And then we put in couple of additional things  
10:24:48 23 that we can discuss with them.

10:24:50 24 But the general concept of waiting until after the  
10:24:52 25 CSR trial and beginning discovery then and up until that point

10:24:58 1 focusing on CSR discovery, we agree with and focusing on  
10:25:03 2 stipulated discovery, we agree with. We have -- we just got  
10:25:07 3 the proposed stipulated discovery on Monday. They actually  
10:25:11 4 served it on Friday, but we got it on Monday. And we're  
10:25:13 5 talking with our client and going through that. And we do need  
10:25:16 6 to meet with them, and I do believe we will be able to come to  
10:25:20 7 a substantial agreement on that. The concept is agreeable with  
10:25:23 8 us.

10:25:24 9 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Anyone else who  
10:25:27 10 desires to speak?

10:25:32 11 MR. NASH: Your Honor, Bill Nash for Kyocera. Just  
10:25:35 12 because of the rush last night of putting out our revision to  
10:25:38 13 that, we did run into a typographical error. I just wanted to  
10:25:46 14 point that out. We failed to insert a mandatory settlement  
10:25:49 15 conference which Kyocera feels it may be time for the parties  
10:25:54 16 to get together with a mediator and try to discuss this.

10:25:57 17 Kyocera would suggest July of 2012 and no later than  
10:26:02 18 that. We've had the Markman, there's been some fact discovery,  
10:26:05 19 and some possibility, one would hope, that all around the table  
10:26:14 20 we might be able to resolve it.

10:26:16 21 THE COURT: What date did you suggest?

10:26:18 22 MR. NASH: We're just suggesting no later than July  
10:26:21 23 2012, before we get going into the next phase of all this  
10:26:24 24 discovery and attorney time and expert time.

10:26:26 25 THE COURT: Mr. Goodpastor?

10:26:29 1 MR. GOODPASTOR: I think we could confer with our  
10:26:31 2 client on that and get back with Mr. Nash very quickly. We're  
10:26:35 3 generally open to settlement discussions, of course. It would  
10:26:37 4 just be the timing and how he wants to structure it that we  
10:26:40 5 need to check with the client on, Your Honor.

10:26:44 6 THE COURT: All right.

10:26:45 7 MR. GOODPASTOR: I do have two very specific  
10:26:47 8 proposals regarding how to resolve the discovery issues in this  
10:26:50 9 case and the issues regarding the pending orders that I'd like  
10:26:55 10 to address, if you don't mind?

10:26:57 11 THE COURT: I don't mind.

10:26:58 12 MR. GOODPASTOR: We have -- and I can show you,  
10:27:01 13 Your Honor. We have sort of a time line that I can hand to the  
10:27:25 14 Clerk.

10:27:25 15 THE COURT: Is this what you put in your letter?

10:27:27 16 MR. GOODPASTOR: This is essentially a time line of  
10:27:29 17 our efforts to --

10:27:30 18 THE COURT: Well, I don't want to hear what you have  
10:27:33 19 done and what CSR has blocked you from doing. I've got far too  
10:27:40 20 many better things to do with my time at this point than  
10:27:45 21 determine who has been reasonable and who has not been  
10:27:48 22 reasonable. Honestly, I don't care.

10:27:50 23 MR. GOODPASTOR: Understood. And so I'll get  
10:27:52 24 directly to our proposal.

10:27:54 25 THE COURT: All right.

10:27:55 1 MR. GOODPASTOR: We have given proposed stipulated  
10:27:58 2 discovery to CSR, to the end-product defendants, and to  
10:28:02 3 Bluetooth SIG. They all have that. CSR has had it since March  
10:28:06 4 28th, and end-products defendants have had it since last Friday  
10:28:09 5 or Monday. Bluetooth SIG just got it a couple of days ago.

10:28:14 6 What we propose is basically a very narrow set of  
10:28:17 7 discovery and make it very easy for them to respond. What we  
10:28:20 8 propose is all those defendants provide their responses to all  
10:28:23 9 of the items we put in that stipulated discovery by April 19th;  
10:28:27 10 that by that date, CSR provide a list of items in their  
10:28:32 11 proposed stipulated discovery that they gave to Bandspeed that  
10:28:36 12 has not already been provided in the 425,000 of pages of  
10:28:40 13 documents that we produced to CSR already; and that we hold a  
10:28:45 14 further status conference on April 23rd.

10:28:47 15 Come here, tell you exactly what's still in dispute,  
10:28:50 16 and at that time set a very accelerated briefing schedule for  
10:28:56 17 any motion to compel that may be required with the hope of --  
10:28:59 18 with that oversight and that schedule, that such a motion to  
10:29:04 19 compel would not be required.

10:29:06 20 We think that would be the most efficient way to  
10:29:08 21 getting what we need to prosecute the case without taking the  
10:29:11 22 Court's time and without actually -- actually minimizing the  
10:29:16 23 burden on the defendants in terms of discovery.

10:29:18 24 So those dates again would be responses from all the  
10:29:22 25 defendants by April 19th, CSR provide a list of documents it

10:29:26 1 believes it does not already have by that date, further status  
10:29:29 2 conference by April 23rd, and then at which time we set a  
10:29:32 3 briefing schedule with a four-day response date on the motion  
10:29:35 4 to compel, if necessary.

10:29:36 5 With regard to the --

10:29:38 6 THE COURT: Tell me who disagrees with that.

10:29:42 7 MR. BOICE: We disagree with those dates,  
10:29:44 8 Your Honor. We can't do it. Bill Boice, again, for Motorola.

10:29:49 9 We just got this, like I said, on Monday and there  
10:29:52 10 are a number of things that we could do.

10:29:55 11 THE COURT: That's fine. I just want to know who  
10:29:58 12 objects to it.

10:29:59 13 Ms. Frost?

10:30:00 14 MS. FROST: Yes, Your Honor. We object to the timing  
10:30:02 15 as well.

10:30:03 16 THE COURT: Well, April 23rd is out, because I don't  
10:30:05 17 have any time to hear you on anything this month. May is bad  
10:30:08 18 enough, but this month is a goner. On April 23rd,  
10:30:11 19 particularly, I have pretrial conferences in the morning and  
10:30:14 20 then I have naturalization ceremony in the afternoon that I  
10:30:17 21 will be preparing for. I have a speaker coming in from out of  
10:30:21 22 town to speak to the soon-to-be-established new citizens. The  
10:30:28 23 proceeding is at the LBJ Auditorium, and we anticipate 300 to  
10:30:33 24 400 new citizens. And there certainly is no time that day to  
10:30:37 25 hold another conference in this case.

10:30:40 1 MR. GOODPASTOR: Given that --

10:30:41 2 THE COURT: Mr. Whittlesey, please rise.

10:30:44 3 MR. WHITTLESEY: Yes, sir. David Whittlesey on  
10:30:46 4 behalf of Toshiba. I had a brief conversation with  
10:30:49 5 Mr. Goodpastor this morning. I just want to make sure that  
10:30:52 6 we're on the same page. You had proposed April 19th for us to  
10:30:57 7 get back to you on whether or not we could comply with your  
10:31:00 8 proposed limited discovery. And if there are disputes, then we  
10:31:03 9 could talk about the disputes. Not to actually provide you  
10:31:06 10 with all the discovery one week from today. I think you may  
10:31:09 11 have -- some defendants may be misunderstanding what you're  
10:31:12 12 saying.

10:31:12 13 MR. GOODPASTOR: No. You're correct,  
10:31:14 14 Mr. Whittlesey. We would want the responses by the 19th. We  
10:31:17 15 put in our scheduling order that --

10:31:18 16 THE COURT: How do you define responses? The  
10:31:20 17 response Mr. Whittlesey refers to or the response to your  
10:31:24 18 requested discovery? That's where the -- am I wrong,  
10:31:28 19 Mr. Whittlesey?

10:31:30 20 MR. WHITTLESEY: What I'd understood him to say is  
10:31:32 21 he's given us a list of stipulated discoveries as, Can you give  
10:31:36 22 us this information? A lot of the defendants just got it this  
10:31:38 23 week. What I'd understood he was asking is we're going to get  
10:31:40 24 back to him within one week and say, yes, we can do item one;  
10:31:43 25 no, we can't do item two; yes, we can do item three. Try to

10:31:48 1 limit the scope of the disagreement, if any, and maybe we can  
10:31:52 2 do all of it. But that's what I understood by the proposal.

10:31:55 3 THE COURT: Is that what you understand?

10:31:56 4 MR. GOODPASTOR: Yes, Your Honor. I think I misused  
10:31:59 5 the word "response."

10:32:00 6 THE COURT: And you thought if you got that  
10:32:02 7 information, then everybody would be ready to have a status  
10:32:08 8 conference by the 23rd with this many people, that you could  
10:32:11 9 sit down and discuss it all on Friday and over the weekend and  
10:32:14 10 be back in here on Monday? I think that's a little optimistic  
10:32:19 11 based on everything else that has gone on in this case.

10:32:21 12 MR. GOODPASTOR: Given the information about your  
10:32:23 13 availability, Your Honor, essentially what we're dealing with  
10:32:26 14 is Mr. Whittlesey and members of the firm that's co-counsel  
10:32:30 15 with him, Ms. Frost, and counsel for Bluetooth SIG. The  
10:32:36 16 defendants have done a good job of appointing a liaison counsel  
10:32:38 17 to address a lot of these issues.

10:32:40 18 But given your schedule and the inability to meet on  
10:32:42 19 the 23rd, we may just have a date that you set whereby we file  
10:32:49 20 just a joint status report and we have an agreed briefing  
10:32:53 21 schedule for a motion to compel on some other date you set  
10:32:56 22 today. And we don't need a status conference in front of  
10:33:00 23 Your Honor. I think what will motivate the parties to reach  
10:33:03 24 agreement is the fact that there are firm deadlines -- firm  
10:33:05 25 deadlines by which we get answers to whether they agree or

10:33:09 1 don't agree, firm deadlines by which we report to the Court,  
10:33:15 2 and a firm deadline by which a response is due.

10:33:18 3 THE COURT: Well, it might have helped you, but it  
10:33:20 4 hasn't helped me, because every time I roll over, I find  
10:33:20 5 there's another case pending somewhere in the country involving  
10:33:24 6 these same issues, which I was annoyed about when there was one  
10:33:27 7 in the Eastern District, I was annoyed when there was one in  
10:33:34 8 Arizona, and now I find there's one in California. And I go  
10:33:37 9 back to where I was two years, and I'm not going to ask you-all  
10:33:43 10 to explain it now. But I will never understand why you have  
10:33:50 11 been filing cases all around the country, which does nothing  
10:33:53 12 but disrupt scheduling orders every time one Court thinks that  
10:33:58 13 the Court is ruling on something.

10:33:59 14 It seems to me that all the other judges seem to  
10:34:02 15 think they're coming here. I've now gotten the Arizona case.  
10:34:06 16 I will admit to you there might be a certain amount of payback  
10:34:11 17 in there because I sent a complex case to the District of  
10:34:15 18 Arizona about eight months ago, and I have a suspicion that the  
10:34:21 19 judges were lying in wait to see if something came that they  
10:34:25 20 could send back to me. And so that's why I got the part of  
10:34:28 21 this case. What is going to happen with the California case?

10:34:34 22 MR. GOODPASTOR: Your Honor, we've -- the California  
10:34:35 23 case was filed on January 20 approximately -- a little bit over  
10:34:40 24 a month after you issued your order requiring claims be filed  
10:34:43 25 in this litigation. The California case expressly refers to



10:34:49 1 the patents in suit in this litigation. It expressly refers to  
10:34:53 2 this litigation itself. Claims are we think virtually  
10:34:57 3 identical to some of the defenses and counterclaims asserted by  
10:35:00 4 CSR in this litigation. And we share your, sort of,  
10:35:03 5 frustration and questioning about why it was even filed in that  
10:35:05 6 state.

10:35:05 7 So there is a motion to dismiss or, in the  
10:35:08 8 alternative, a transfer filed on March 28th by Bandspeed.

10:35:12 9 THE COURT: I can tell you what's going to happen.

10:35:14 10 MR. GOODPASTOR: We don't know what's going to happen  
10:35:16 11 with that.

10:35:17 12 THE COURT: I could guess.

10:35:18 13 MR. GOODPASTOR: We could guess, too, but --

10:35:18 14 THE COURT: This may be patent law, but it's not  
10:35:21 15 always rocket science.

10:35:22 16 MR. GOODPASTOR: That's true, despite what we'd like  
10:35:25 17 to tell ourselves.

10:35:27 18 The two issues of the Arizona and the California  
10:35:29 19 case, and Mr. Smith I believe is on the phone and I think  
10:35:32 20 counsel for CSR is also on phone in those cases as well. But  
10:35:37 21 we believe those cases, along with another California patent  
10:35:40 22 case, basically where CSR required patents and then filed suit  
10:35:45 23 against us the next day, we think those are retaliatory. And  
10:35:48 24 we think that those will be resolved, or those issues will be  
10:35:52 25 resolved or the dispute will be resolved by the trial that

10:35:55 1 you've already set for scheduling here.

10:35:57 2           And so with respect to the transferred Arizona case  
10:36:01 3 and the transfer -- what we think will probably be the  
10:36:05 4 transferred of California case, we think that those transferred  
10:36:07 5 cases should essentially be put on a schedule that begins after  
10:36:14 6 the trial of the CSR-Bandspeed case ends in February. And we  
10:36:18 7 think at that time it will be likely that you won't even have  
10:36:21 8 to proceed with those other cases.

10:36:25 9           THE COURT: Well, I'm going to tell you about those  
10:36:29 10 other cases. To the extent they come here, I'm going to try  
10:36:31 11 any issues in them that are between Bandspeed and CSR on the  
10:36:36 12 trial setting that I have now. I am not going to hold any  
10:36:40 13 Bandspeed-CSR issues back. I want everybody to be clear on  
10:36:44 14 that. What I'm holding back are the cases that we -- that I've  
10:36:51 15 always referred to as the non-CSR defendants, because I want to  
10:36:58 16 get the manufacturing claims done, as I made clear in my order  
10:37:03 17 and in the last discussion we had, where we discussed the  
10:37:11 18 correct way to go or not. And I understand there's a  
10:37:14 19 misunderstanding -- I mean disagreement. But rightly or  
10:37:16 20 wrongly, I've determined that's the way I'm going to do it.

10:37:20 21           So it's only going to be the end-product defendants'  
10:37:22 22 cases that are going to have issues held until after that. I'm  
10:37:27 23 not going to -- if it comes in from California, fine. Arizona  
10:37:31 24 is here. But one of the reasons that I have my staff contact  
10:37:34 25 you to tell all sides if you wanted to have Arizona counsel

10:37:38 1 present by phone for this hearing, you could, was to make it  
10:37:41 2 clear that I'm going to try all of the Bandspeed-CSR issues at  
10:37:46 3 one time, however long it takes.

10:37:47 4 MR. GOODPASTOR: Your Honor, there are a couple of  
10:37:49 5 issues involved with that and -- that we're going to need to  
10:37:53 6 address and we may not be able to address them today. One is  
10:37:56 7 that Bandspeed is represented by separate counsel in both the  
10:37:59 8 California and the Arizona case.

10:38:00 9 THE COURT: Number one, they're going to have to work  
10:38:02 10 that out. Your client is going to have to work that out with  
10:38:05 11 you and the other lawyers.

10:38:06 12 MR. GOODPASTOR: The other issue is that the transfer  
10:38:08 13 of those cases and resolution of those issues on the current  
10:38:12 14 trial schedule is going to be very difficult for Bandspeed with  
10:38:15 15 regard to those -- those particular actions in those cases. In  
10:38:21 16 fact, they're both at very early stages. One hasn't even  
10:38:24 17 proceeded to Markman. We would like the opportunity to confer  
10:38:31 18 with Arizona and California counsel and with CSR to discuss the  
10:38:34 19 scheduling of those.

10:38:36 20 THE COURT: Well, you need to do that, because I'm  
10:38:38 21 not going to be inclined to try Bandspeed-CSR issues  
10:38:41 22 separately.

10:38:43 23 MR. GOODPASTOR: Okay. Then what we will do, then,  
10:38:45 24 is confer with CSR and come up with a revised schedule for the  
10:38:49 25 current trial between the two parties.

10:38:52 1 THE COURT: Well, you need to give primary  
10:38:54 2 consideration to how quickly you can get discovery done in it,  
10:38:58 3 because I'm not very sympathetic to extending things. I'll  
10:39:03 4 just tell you that.

10:39:05 5 MR. GOODPASTOR: We understand that. We don't  
10:39:06 6 believe in the case of the Arizona case or the California case,  
10:39:10 7 we were the cause of that. Because I'm not counsel in those  
10:39:15 8 cases, I don't know what discovery is needed and what timing is  
10:39:18 9 required. I will agree that we will do our very best to confer  
10:39:22 10 as quickly as possible and try to get some agreement with CSR  
10:39:26 11 and put it in front of you.

10:39:27 12 THE COURT: Well, I think all we can really  
10:39:29 13 accomplish today is a time to get me a joint status report on  
10:39:33 14 all of the matters that we have discussed here today so I can  
10:39:37 15 look at the filings and determine what I'm going to do with my  
10:39:42 16 schedule. Know this: The schedule is going to be fast, and  
10:39:47 17 the chances of it being perceptively slower than what is  
10:39:53 18 expressed in my existing order are not very good.

10:39:57 19 I've had this case or part of this dispute hanging  
10:40:01 20 around with me for longer than I care. My docket is doing  
10:40:06 21 nothing but getting larger. In this month alone I tried a  
10:40:13 22 civil jury case the first week of the month, I had a bench  
10:40:16 23 trial this week and a preliminary injunction hearing that we  
10:40:21 24 wrapped up this morning on whether I'm going to preliminarily  
10:40:25 25 enjoin a 100-million-dollar highway project. I have a jury

10:40:30 1 trial that I'm starting on Monday. May is only marginally  
10:40:37 2 better, but that is the way the docket is going.

10:40:40 3           The Congress shows no sympathy to the dockets any  
10:40:44 4 where in this country, so I do not believe I'm going to have a  
10:40:48 5 third federal judge. Judge Sparks' docket is every bit as busy  
10:40:53 6 as mine. So when I find a hole and render scheduling orders,  
10:40:59 7 every lawyer who practices in front of me needs to know that  
10:41:04 8 it's going to be much harder to get any relief from those  
10:41:07 9 orders just because I have a lot of demands on my time and a  
10:41:11 10 lot of cases that we try.

10:41:14 11           Now, Mr. Whittlesey, let me ask you: What do you  
10:41:21 12 think would be a reasonable period of time, since you had an  
10:41:25 13 issue with a disclosure on the 19th and then a hearing on the  
10:41:32 14 23rd, how much time do you think is necessary to get a  
10:41:38 15 follow-up joint status report to this court.

10:41:42 16           MR. WHITTLESEY: I certainly think, Your Honor,  
10:41:44 17 within two weeks we ought to be able to get back in touch with  
10:41:49 18 them and let them know what issues we have with the discovery  
10:41:53 19 and then confer.

10:41:54 20           THE COURT: Tell me when -- do you think the joint  
10:41:56 21 status report could be filed in two weeks?

10:41:59 22           MR. WHITTLESEY: Two weeks?

10:42:00 23           THE COURT: That's what I'm interested in.

10:42:03 24           MR. WHITTLESEY: Two weeks, Your Honor, would be  
10:42:05 25 fine.

10:42:06 1 THE COURT: Mr. Goodpastor, do you think that will  
10:42:09 2 work for you?

10:42:10 3 MR. GOODPASTOR: That will work for us, Your Honor,  
10:42:11 4 provided we get the response in a timely manner, which I think  
10:42:16 5 we can most likely work out with Mr. Whittlesey.

10:42:18 6 THE COURT: Well, it sounds like there's not any  
10:42:20 7 reluctance on getting you the information you need. It's a  
10:42:22 8 question of how much time it's going to take. I didn't hear  
10:42:25 9 anybody saying they're not willing to do that. It's just that  
10:42:29 10 it couldn't be done on the schedule you first suggested. If  
10:42:32 11 somebody disagrees with that, let me know.

10:42:38 12 MS. FROST: Excuse me, Your Honor. This is  
10:42:40 13 Claudia Frost for CSR. I'm not sure whether I'm on this status  
10:42:44 14 report on these scheduling issues and discovery. But if I am,  
10:42:48 15 with respect to Mr. Goodpastor's suggestion that it can be done  
10:42:52 16 promptly, basically, what has happened is they recently  
10:42:56 17 produced the documents they produced in the Eastern District to  
10:42:59 18 us. We haven't even seen them yet. They're being loaded on a  
10:43:03 19 computer database.

10:43:06 20 Instead of providing us answers to the questions of  
10:43:09 21 whether Bandspeed can comply with our stipulated discovery  
10:43:13 22 requests, they're basically telling us to look through the  
10:43:17 23 400,000 pages they've given us and if there's anything else we  
10:43:20 24 want, tell them. And I think that's very inefficient, and I  
10:43:25 25 certainly cannot commit to do that in two weeks. So if they

10:43:28 1 could work with me a little bit to try to give me some better  
10:43:30 2 clues about whether they've produced is covered by my topics, I  
10:43:34 3 could probably meet that schedule.

10:43:35 4 THE COURT: Mr. Goodpastor, tell her right now.

10:43:39 5 MR. GOODPASTOR: What we proposed is that we get a  
10:43:42 6 response from CSR in terms of discovery we asked for from them  
10:43:46 7 and that they tell us, after we've already complied with all of  
10:43:49 8 the discovery requests that they've asked for and produced the  
10:43:53 9 documents they've asked for, what they think is missing. We've  
10:43:56 10 already complied with their single request for production that  
10:44:00 11 they've issued.

10:44:01 12 THE COURT: She says, based on what you complied  
10:44:03 13 with, she can't know what else she needs in two weeks.

10:44:09 14 MR. GOODPASTOR: Well, we -- I think we can get a  
10:44:11 15 response from CSR to whether they're going to agree to our  
10:44:15 16 request for discovery in two weeks. It seems clear we can do  
10:44:18 17 that. If they need more time to tell us what else they need  
10:44:21 18 from us, we're willing to give them more time. But with  
10:44:24 19 respect to the discovery we are asking for from them ...

10:44:28 20 THE COURT: Well, let me just tell you-all again.  
10:44:30 21 I'm not going to be in the time business in this case. All of  
10:44:33 22 these discussions we're having now are things that should have  
10:44:36 23 been done a year ago. We should have been at this stage a year  
10:44:40 24 ago in this case. I'm not pleased with either of the major  
10:44:43 25 sides in this case. And to a degree, I rue the day that I

10:44:49 1 allowed CSR's intervention, because I might have been able to  
10:44:52 2 try all of these other people by now and had them out of it and  
10:44:57 3 then having the debate with CSR on who is liable and who is  
10:45:01 4 not.

10:45:02 5 But, you know, I'll tell you both, Ms. Frost, I'm not  
10:45:05 6 looking at giving people a large amount of time here.

10:45:10 7 Mr. Goodpastor, when did you produce these documents from the  
10:45:15 8 Eastern District of Texas?

10:45:17 9 MR. GOODPASTOR: April 5th, Your Honor.

10:45:18 10 THE COURT: That's pretty -- you know, this case came  
10:45:21 11 to me, when, last September from the Eastern District of  
10:45:24 12 Texas? August? It was before Judge Ward retired, because that  
10:45:27 13 was his going-away present. Had he taken senior status, I  
10:45:31 14 would have had a way to get back at him. But he retired so he  
10:45:35 15 could avoid anything I might do to him.

10:45:39 16 MR. GOODPASTOR: We -- frankly, we anticipated  
10:45:43 17 producing that discovery. We proposed that form production in  
10:45:47 18 our discovery order. We sent a similar request to CSR to see  
10:45:51 19 if they would agree to that. I think we informed the Court  
10:45:54 20 that their request to us actually complied with our proposed  
10:45:58 21 discovery order. We couldn't get agreement from CSR to do  
10:46:02 22 that, so we just produced it as quickly as we could. We  
10:46:04 23 re-labeled everything, got it over to them as quickly as we  
10:46:07 24 could, and said, Here it is. Here is everything you asked for.

10:46:09 25 THE COURT: Because of the size of this case, what



10:46:11 1 Bandspeed and CSR needs to do -- and you need to take this  
10:46:15 2 message back to your client -- is they need to have lawyers  
10:46:19 3 doing nothing else but working on this case from that point --  
10:46:24 4 from this point forward, if you don't already have that. And  
10:46:28 5 it needs to be the lawyers that are going to appear in front of  
10:46:31 6 me. If we have got to go through all of this discovery and  
10:46:36 7 what we're going to do before you-all determine if you can  
10:46:39 8 settle the case, that's fine. But I'm not going to give you  
10:46:42 9 much in the way of time to do it. You're just going to -- if  
10:46:45 10 it's that important, you're going to have to put the manpower  
10:46:49 11 on it to get it done on a short schedule.

10:46:51 12 MR. GOODPASTOR: What we propose is that CSR provide  
10:46:54 13 their response to our stipulated discovery at the same time the  
10:46:56 14 other defendants do, and then they get an extra two weeks to  
10:46:59 15 provide us with whatever else they need.

10:47:02 16 THE COURT: All right. Let me hear from other  
10:47:03 17 lawyers.

10:47:04 18 MR. BOICE: Your Honor, I just didn't want to mislead  
10:47:06 19 you there about what we are able to provide. I don't know that  
10:47:09 20 we'll be able to provide all the stipulated discovery without  
10:47:12 21 talking to our client and whether we have it or not and whether  
10:47:14 22 it makes any sense or not. I know some of it we clearly will  
10:47:17 23 be able to, but we certainly can meet this schedule to meet  
10:47:21 24 with them and respond to the Court.

10:47:22 25 And, Your Honor, the second thing that, if I might,

10:47:24 1 on the time, you also mentioned that we should get back to you  
10:47:28 2 on the proposed differences in our schedules for the  
10:47:32 3 end-product defendants. And we can meet with them and get that  
10:47:36 4 in the same period of time, if that's what you had in mind.

10:47:39 5 THE COURT: That is what I did have in mind.

10:47:44 6 MR. BOICE: Okay. Thank you.

10:47:45 7 THE COURT: Anybody over here against the wall? Did  
10:47:48 8 y'all have anything you wanted to add?

10:47:53 9 MR. WHITTLESEY: Your Honor, David Whittlesey again.  
10:47:58 10 Just so we're clear, the proposal is we'll get back to  
10:48:01 11 Mr. Goodpastor within a week and then we'll submit the joint  
10:48:04 12 status report in two weeks?

10:48:05 13 THE COURT: What I want is a joint status report no  
10:48:08 14 later than 5 o'clock. That means you don't get to file it at  
10:48:12 15 11:59:55. By 5 o'clock on the April the 22nd. There may be  
10:48:22 16 things you've agreed to. There may be things you haven't  
10:48:25 17 agreed to. These issues on Ms. Frost's concern, all of that  
10:48:31 18 needs to be in the joint status report, and you should tell me  
10:48:34 19 what you have done to try to work those out and what's  
10:48:37 20 realistic.

10:48:38 21 MR. WHITTLESEY: Thank you, Judge.

10:48:39 22 THE COURT: And then I will look at that and see,  
10:48:43 23 once I know what criminal and civil cases I have to try in  
10:48:47 24 May -- right now I continue to have four civil cases pending to  
10:48:53 25 try for May, and right now I have 12 criminal jury trials to

10:48:59 1 try in May. Now, I will tell you all of those cases aren't  
10:49:02 2 going to go to trial. But what we're having with increased  
10:49:06 3 dockets is Judge Sparks and I are finding we're not trying a  
10:49:09 4 higher percentage of our cases than we ever have. But when you  
10:49:13 5 increase the gross number and put the same percentage on it,  
10:49:17 6 that results in more cases and there are no more -- you know  
10:49:22 7 the days in the month do not respond to percentages.

10:49:26 8 And so that's what we're finding we're having  
10:49:29 9 happening here. We have more cases going to trial, not because  
10:49:33 10 of the number of cases lawyers normally try, but when you have  
10:49:37 11 a larger number and put the same percentage on it, you try more  
10:49:40 12 cases. So I have got to see how that is going to sort itself  
10:49:47 13 out before I know when I'm going to be able to get you back in  
10:49:49 14 here. Ms. Frost, do you have something?

10:49:52 15 MS. FROST: Yes, Your Honor, I do. I have two brief  
10:49:54 16 things. One to mention -- what I neglected to mention earlier  
10:50:02 17 is the issue of the antitrust claims that are in this case. I  
10:50:06 18 believe all the defendants have been -- or involved in some  
10:50:14 19 antitrust allegation from Bandspeed here. And all of those  
10:50:17 20 claims are basically, except for the claim as to CSR are a  
10:50:21 21 resident in the second phase of the case with the end-product  
10:50:24 22 or customer defendants, as I call them. And it seems to me  
10:50:29 23 logical to put all the antitrust claims, because they're  
10:50:36 24 conspiracy claims, in one bucket.

10:50:38 25 And so to the extent that requires a modification to

10:50:41 1 the schedule or impacts this schedule -- the scheduling order  
10:50:44 2 that you have before you, I would submit that the CSR part of  
10:50:48 3 that case should reside in that bucket on that schedule.

10:50:53 4 THE COURT: All right. Well, I will submit to  
10:50:55 5 you-all that y'all could explain that in something that  
10:51:03 6 contains no more than three pages and get it to me.

10:51:06 7 MS. FROST: I will do that.

10:51:07 8 THE COURT: This goes much simpler if everybody is  
10:51:10 9 not running around the country filing new lawsuits and  
10:51:13 10 everybody is talking about this case. I put the major burden  
10:51:16 11 on the two of you. I am not pleased with the fact that we have  
10:51:19 12 other litigation filed in the Eastern District of Texas. I am  
10:51:25 13 not pleased with the fact we have other litigation filed in  
10:51:29 14 Arizona. I am not pleased with the fact we have other  
10:51:31 15 litigation filed in California.

10:51:33 16 I understand that you perceive there to be a good  
10:51:35 17 reason for doing that. But due to the fact that those judges,  
10:51:39 18 at least in two out of those three instances, transferred the  
10:51:43 19 cases here, I would think being the good lawyers you are, you  
10:51:49 20 might look at the way you have proceeded in this case and give  
10:51:51 21 some thought to the fact that maybe you're not pleasing any  
10:51:54 22 number of federal judges around the country with what you're  
10:52:02 23 doing, because, you know, we're going to get this done, if I  
10:52:06 24 haven't made that clear. And we're going to get it done pretty  
10:52:09 25 much on the schedule I have, if y'all have to spend 24 hours a

10:52:13 1 day to get it done. So know that.

10:52:16 2 I don't care if you settle it. I don't care if you  
10:52:19 3 try it. There is some merit to the idea that's been proposed  
10:52:26 4 of mandatory mediation. I will tell you I am not optimistic  
10:52:29 5 about that, because every time I've gotten optimistic about  
10:52:33 6 anything in this case, it's been like touching a hot stove.

10:52:36 7 But I want in that status report on April 26th, your  
10:52:42 8 discussions about mandatory mediation and whether you think it  
10:52:48 9 would be helpful and when you think you could get it done and  
10:52:52 10 if you have an idea of a mediator. I know several that are  
10:52:58 11 good, but I don't handpick that. If the parties want me to  
10:53:03 12 select one, I will select one. Otherwise, whoever you think  
10:53:06 13 will be good, you can do it if you want to do this.

10:53:09 14 But I will tell you the good mediators that I know,  
10:53:13 15 July is pretty close because they fill up and it takes a while  
10:53:20 16 to get on their schedule. So if you are seriously considering  
10:53:25 17 asking me to order this case to mediation, you need to give  
10:53:32 18 some thought about how serious you are about that and whether  
10:53:34 19 you have an idea of a mediator and find out from that mediator  
10:53:38 20 whether he owns an apartment building so each party can have  
10:53:42 21 its own room or series of rooms to be in, because if you're  
10:53:47 22 going to try to shoot for July, we're running out of time in a  
10:53:52 23 big hurry to do that with people that could actually do you  
10:53:55 24 some good if you wanted to do this. So I give you that to  
10:54:00 25 think about.

10:54:00 1 MS. FROST: Thank you, Your Honor. One other thing  
10:54:05 2 just to be clear that would be appropriate for the status  
10:54:08 3 report -- I assume that it would be, but just to be sure --  
10:54:12 4 there's a lot of activity right now by Bandspeed in the  
10:54:16 5 United States Patent Office. They are amending a number of  
10:54:20 6 claims that are in the patents-in-suit and, at least with  
10:54:24 7 regard to one of them, have added 400 new claims as of two days  
10:54:29 8 ago. So would you like us to bring that to your attention as  
10:54:32 9 well in the status report or in some separate report or how you  
10:54:36 10 like us to apprise you of --

10:54:37 11 THE COURT: Well, if you would like for me to know  
10:54:40 12 that, I think everyone in this room knows that I am not prone  
10:54:43 13 to stay a case while the PTO looks at re-examination. I  
10:54:47 14 understand that in the last two years they have revised their  
10:54:50 15 rules. I go around, I hear them talk about how streamlined  
10:54:54 16 they are, and how they're dealing with things faster. I'm not  
10:54:57 17 believing it.

10:55:04 18 I fault the Congress more than I do them. I think  
10:55:07 19 the Congress should have dealt with it in the American Invents  
10:55:12 20 Act parallel proceedings. I don't think any district judge  
10:55:16 21 would mind if the Congress said that the patent office has  
10:55:20 22 primary jurisdiction or if the Congress said that the district  
10:55:23 23 courts have primary jurisdiction. They've chosen not to do  
10:55:27 24 that. So we're still left with that. I as a general rule,  
10:55:31 25 barring -- because I never say never, but barring some huge

10:55:36 1 occurrence, I am not inclined to stay a proceeding in my Court  
10:55:40 2 while I wait around and see what the patent office is going to  
10:55:44 3 do.

10:55:45 4 And when I've looked at what they're doing, I find  
10:55:47 5 out that we get notices that say we're not going to out these  
10:55:54 6 claims. And then six or eight weeks will pass, and I'll get  
10:55:57 7 another notice and I'll find out it doesn't mean what it says  
10:55:59 8 because there's still things going on up there. So they're not  
10:56:01 9 doing anything that helps me get the cases on my docket  
10:56:05 10 resolved by parallel proceedings.

10:56:06 11 So you can report on anything you want to on that.  
10:56:09 12 It's always nice to know. But unless something comes up that  
10:56:14 13 gives me more cold comfort from the PTO than I have now, I'm  
10:56:19 14 not going to put anything off in this case while I wait and see  
10:56:22 15 what they do.

10:56:23 16 MS. FROST: Thank you, Your Honor. We'll put  
10:56:24 17 something in there. I believe there are some intervening  
10:56:25 18 rights issues which may actually have some impact. And we'll  
10:56:27 19 note those with special specificity.

10:56:31 20 THE COURT: So what is the term of these patents? We  
10:56:33 21 have got -- we have bound to eaten into them a lot. And if we  
10:56:37 22 continue to have litigation, can't we all moot the thing  
10:56:44 23 because the patent expired?

10:56:45 24 MR. GOODPASTOR: We think we have several years left  
10:56:47 25 on the patent.

10:56:48 1 THE COURT: I think you might have several years left  
10:56:50 2 before I clear every case that involves every one I'm looking  
10:56:54 3 at.

10:56:58 4 All right. Anything else?

10:56:59 5 MR. GOODPASTOR: Your Honor, I did mention an earlier  
10:57:01 6 proposal regarding the pending discovery orders, the protective  
10:57:04 7 order, the discovery order, and the ESI order. And I would  
10:57:09 8 like to briefly respond to Ms. Frost's comments about the  
10:57:14 9 antitrust claims.

10:57:15 10 We have been working with Ms. Frost back and forth to  
10:57:17 11 try to get something in front of you on the protective order,  
10:57:21 12 the discovery order, and the ESI order that is easier for you  
10:57:24 13 to review because of the different formats that were submitted  
10:57:27 14 by the parties. We have basically met and conferred and come  
10:57:31 15 up with a red line that we can put in front of you, we think --  
10:57:35 16 we wanted to do it before the hearing, but they -- Ms. Frost  
10:57:38 17 wasn't in a position to do it.

10:57:40 18 THE COURT: Put it on a disc, and send it to  
10:57:42 19 Ms. Carmona. She'll tell you how to get it there. I will tell  
10:57:48 20 you that has been a problem, and that's one of the reasons that  
10:57:51 21 you're later -- later than I would normally do, because we have  
10:57:54 22 spent no small amount of time excerpting pieces from both of  
10:57:59 23 your proposals that I thought had merit and coming up with my  
10:58:05 24 own document. If you have made progress on yours and you can  
10:58:10 25 give it to us on a disc that points out exactly where you have



10:58:16 1 disagreement, that would make things go quicker.

10:58:18 2 MR. GOODPASTOR: Okay. And we'd like the parties to  
10:58:20 3 agree to submit that by no later than Monday.

10:58:24 4 MS. FROST: That's fine with us.

10:58:25 5 THE COURT: Whatever you decide to do, put -- or  
10:58:27 6 E-mail it. Ms. Carmona, that would work, wouldn't it? We just  
10:58:31 7 want to get it from you electronically where we have it  
10:58:35 8 electronically so we don't have to retype the whole thing,  
10:58:39 9 which is what we've been doing.

10:58:40 10 MR. GOODPASTOR: That's one of the objections to  
10:58:42 11 producing some documents we've had, is the protective order.  
10:58:43 12 So I think we can resolve that pretty quickly.

10:58:45 13 THE COURT: Well, and that's one of my irritations,  
10:58:46 14 because I have never been able to figure out why lawyers can't  
10:58:49 15 agree on the form of protection you're going to put on it,  
10:58:53 16 because -- know this, because some of you don't know my  
10:58:58 17 thinking. Some of you are getting the idea that when you file  
10:59:02 18 all these things under seal that I think lawyers want to much  
10:59:04 19 sealed. We live -- we have a transparent court system. We've  
10:59:08 20 had this current court system since 1789, or shortly  
10:59:14 21 thereafter, since the Judiciary Act.

10:59:18 22 It is an open system. If you choose to go into  
10:59:20 23 court, you don't get to do it secretly. That's why during the  
10:59:25 24 discovery phases I will allow sealing of documents that you may  
10:59:29 25 assert are proprietary or something to that effect and why I

10:59:34 1 generally don't allow the sealing of pleadings, because I think  
10:59:37 2 anyone here should be an adept enough pleader to plead  
10:59:44 3 something that doesn't disclose proprietary or sensitive  
10:59:48 4 information. And if you can't do that, then you need to go  
10:59:50 5 back to whoever taught you how to plead things and work on it.

10:59:54 6           Once we get to the trial, it's a different bag of  
10:59:57 7 cat. There's going to be very little that will be sealed. So  
11:00:03 8 once you're putting on your evidence and once you're having  
11:00:06 9 your trial, a lot of this may come out.

11:00:12 10           So know this, so nobody is blind-sided, that it's a  
11:00:16 11 bifurcated deal with me. What I'm going to seal in discovery  
11:00:19 12 is different from what I'm going to seal during trial. So you  
11:00:22 13 need to start thinking about that, because once you're in a  
11:00:25 14 lawsuit, you're in a lawsuit. Once you're in a public trial,  
11:00:28 15 you're in a public trial.

11:00:32 16           MR. GOODPASTOR: One other issues on the antitrust  
11:00:34 17 claims. From earlier statements at an earlier status  
11:00:37 18 conference, the direction that we understood from the Court was  
11:00:40 19 that all the antitrust claims regarding CSR were going to be  
11:00:43 20 resolved in this one case against CSR, including CSR's  
11:00:47 21 California antitrust claims. And we think that's the most  
11:00:49 22 efficient way. We don't leave some claims against CSR hanging  
11:00:52 23 out there, especially ones as important as our conspiracy  
11:00:55 24 claims. So I just want to make sure you knew that we disagreed  
11:00:59 25 with Ms. Frost on this idea of pushing things out.

11:01:02 1 THE COURT: I understand that, and here -- I  
11:01:04 2 understand what Ms. Frost is saying. But CSR has told me  
11:01:08 3 consistently, if we get the claims between Bandspeed and the  
11:01:12 4 manufacturers done, it might resolve a lot of this lawsuit. I  
11:01:15 5 don't know why I would want to get the claims between Bandspeed  
11:01:19 6 and CSR behind me and then have another lawsuit between  
11:01:26 7 Bandspeed and CSR.

11:01:29 8 MR. GOODPASTOR: I would tend to agree with you,  
11:01:31 9 Your Honor.

11:01:31 10 THE COURT: I would rather have a long lawsuit.  
11:01:34 11 Because as I said, by the time we get there, I'm going to have  
11:01:40 12 things I can do with my docket that I cannot do right now.

11:01:43 13 It is likely that Judge Sparks will have taken senior  
11:01:47 14 status by then, and there will be another full-time federal  
11:01:50 15 judge here. Judge Sparks, I feel certain, is going to want to  
11:01:53 16 carry a full senior status docket, which means he's going to be  
11:01:56 17 handling 40 to 50 percent of the normal docket, which  
11:02:00 18 effectively gives me half a judge to work with, which is a big,  
11:02:03 19 big percentage. Plus I'm going to have vacant courtrooms.

11:02:09 20 Austin is a nice place. I already get offers from  
11:02:12 21 judges around the country who would like to come and sit in  
11:02:16 22 Austin. I don't have any place to put them right now. I will  
11:02:19 23 come November. In fact, Judge Head from Corpus strong-armed me  
11:02:24 24 in January and forced me to tell him when I had a February  
11:02:27 25 vacation set and came up here and handled a case in February.

11:02:32 1 He said, You're going to have a vacant courtroom in February.

11:02:35 2 So let me come up and do that.

11:02:37 3 So it -- after I get passed November, all of the  
11:02:43 4 docket problems I'm having right now don't go away, but they  
11:02:47 5 become much easier for me to deal with. So you need to be  
11:02:52 6 aware of that.

11:02:53 7 MR. BOICE: May I make one comment in response?

11:02:55 8 MR. GOODPASTOR: Well, one other issue with regard to  
11:02:57 9 the antitrust, if you don't mind. One issue, and I think it  
11:03:01 10 will help us reach agreement on the discovery stipulation that  
11:03:04 11 we're going to report you. The one issue that we've  
11:03:06 12 encountered is that they claim that antitrust discovery isn't  
11:03:11 13 appropriate right now because motions to dismiss are pending.  
11:03:12 14 We disagree with that, and we just don't want to wait another  
11:03:16 15 two weeks to have to put that issue in front of you. We have  
11:03:20 16 prepared a short memorandum on the issue which we could submit  
11:03:23 17 to you at this time.

11:03:24 18 THE COURT: Let me ask you a question: Have I stated  
11:03:28 19 that discovery on that antitrust should be held up while I deal  
11:03:33 20 with motions to dismiss?

11:03:34 21 MR. GOODPASTOR: No, you have not, Your Honor.

11:03:36 22 THE COURT: Then you're eating into your discovery  
11:03:39 23 time. That's all I can tell you. I'm not going to do that *ad*  
11:03:44 24 *seriatim*. I will get to the motions to dismiss as quickly as I  
11:03:47 25 can get to the motions to dismiss. But be forewarned: You

11:03:51 1 should be proceeding with everything.

11:03:54 2 MR. GOODPASTOR: Thank you, Your Honor.

11:03:57 3 THE COURT: Anything else?

11:03:58 4 MS. FROST: I just have two brief responses, if I  
11:04:01 5 may, one on the antitrust claims. I think it is a little  
11:04:05 6 different, Your Honor, than trying all the CSR and Bandspeed  
11:04:08 7 claims in one because the same antitrust claim will be tried  
11:04:15 8 against -- the very same antitrust claim will be tried against  
11:04:18 9 everyone else in that second case. And some of it will  
11:04:21 10 potentially be affected by the licensing defense that's in the  
11:04:25 11 first case. So there is actually some sense to the idea. But  
11:04:28 12 I'll set that out in our status report.

11:04:31 13 The second thing I wanted to clarify, and just to  
11:04:35 14 make sure that I am understanding so I can better communicate  
11:04:38 15 with Mr. Goodpastor to work out whatever differences we have  
11:04:42 16 that remain on our protective order, which are minor, by the  
11:04:46 17 way, they deal primarily with source code and our source code,  
11:04:49 18 which is our crown jewel. So we're trying to be very  
11:04:53 19 protective of that.

11:04:54 20 And one of the things we are working with each other  
11:04:56 21 to try to resolve is some tension between -- the difference  
11:05:00 22 between the way pretrial discovery protection is maintained and  
11:05:05 23 trial protection is maintained. And we are trying to make sure  
11:05:08 24 that our source code receives the same amount of protection in  
11:05:12 25 both proceedings. And I don't take Your Honor's comments today

11:05:15 1 to be contrary to that understanding.

11:05:18 2 THE COURT: They're not contrary to that, but you  
11:05:19 3 shouldn't worry about that as much as you're worried about it.

11:05:24 4 MS. FROST: Okay. Good.

11:05:24 5 THE COURT: What I am concerned about right now is  
11:05:31 6 getting through the discovery phase and you reaching a  
11:05:34 7 protective order on what gives you both cold comfort on  
11:05:38 8 protecting your source code for purposes of discovery, you  
11:05:41 9 get -- by the time we get to trial, a lot of these issues that  
11:05:44 10 I'm dealing with are going to resolve themselves one way or the  
11:05:49 11 other. All of the discovery issues will.

11:05:51 12 You know, discovery is a big deal until you get down  
11:05:54 13 to trying a case, and then none of it shows up in trial. You  
11:05:57 14 know, its as simple as that. So you get another bite at the  
11:06:02 15 apple on how you're going to have your source code protected at  
11:06:05 16 trial. You may write into your protective order, if you can  
11:06:13 17 agree, any language you want about this applies for discovery  
11:06:16 18 purposes and the parties recognize that they will bring it back  
11:06:21 19 up and discuss it when the Court has an opportunity to meet  
11:06:24 20 with you for final pretrial conference before trial. And look  
11:06:29 21 at what you actually need in the way of protection at trial.

11:06:33 22 Because as I told you, I -- public trial is a little  
11:06:38 23 bit different than discovery, but I still recognize that there  
11:06:41 24 are things that are going to need some type of protection. But  
11:06:45 25 whatever you -- you should be concentrating on the protection

11:06:49 1 you need for discovery, and we'll worry about the protection  
11:06:52 2 that you need for trial later. So you get another shot at  
11:06:57 3 that.

11:06:58 4 MS. FROST: Thank you, Your Honor. That's helpful.

11:07:00 5 THE COURT: Anything else?

11:07:02 6 (No response)

11:07:02 7 THE COURT: All right. Glad to have had y'all here  
11:07:05 8 this morning. It's always good to see you. Everybody go out  
11:07:09 9 and plead somebody else so we can have more lawyers here.  
11:07:13 10 We're welcome -- we welcome our friends from the west who are  
11:07:18 11 here by phone today. You know, maybe the next time we have a  
11:07:23 12 hearing, it will be during South by Southwest or one of our  
11:07:27 13 other music festivals and you can come.

11:07:30 14 So at this time, the Court's in recess subject to  
11:07:32 15 reconvening after I see the joint status report we have talked  
11:07:38 16 about. And with regard to Bandspeed and CSR, get what you can  
11:07:42 17 on the protective order to Ms. Carmona electronically as  
11:07:47 18 quickly as you can get it there.

11:07:48 19 Court's in recess.

11:07:50 20 (End of transcript)

21

22

23

24

25

1 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT        )**

2 **WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS            )**

3       I, Arlinda Rodriguez, Official Court Reporter, United  
4 States District Court, Western District of Texas, do certify  
5 that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of  
6 proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

7       I certify that the transcript fees and format comply with  
8 those prescribed by the Court and Judicial Conference of the  
9 United States

10       WITNESS MY OFFICIAL HAND this the 18th day of April 2012.

11

12                                    /S/ Arlinda Rodriguez  
13                                   Arlinda Rodriguez, Texas CSR 7753  
14                                   Expiration Date: 12/31/2012  
15                                   Official Court Reporter  
16                                   United States District Court  
17                                   Austin Division  
18                                   200 West 8th Street, 2nd Floor  
19                                   Austin, Texas 78701  
20                                   (512) 916-5143

21

22

23

24

25